

So it is not only investors and developing countries who should view Mexico as a wake up call. We in the OECD and the international financial institutions must begin now to put in place the institutional arrangements to handle the next Mexico. The United States simply cannot be the permanent ad hoc lender of last resort.

The current Mexico faces a long road as it pursues democratization and economic reform. During the NAFTA debate, we heard why Mexico's success is important to us in the United States. We need a stable, democratic and prosperous neighbor to our south for reasons of our own stability, democracy, and prosperity.

Nothing that has happened since December 20 has changed that calculation. We cannot turn our backs on Mexico, and Mexico cannot lose faith with itself.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS].

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

Last November, the American people sent a message loud and clear to Washington. I know first-hand, having heard this message in cafes and town hall meetings all across the State of Minnesota.

It is a simple message, with all the wisdom and common sense of the people who sent it. And yet, it is a message that Congress has failed to heed until this year.

It is time to change the way Congress taxes and spends the people's money.

This message is the same, whether I hear from parents worried about the economic future of their children, workers who fear the impact of the deficit on their jobs, or families who manage each year to balance their own books.

Cut spending, balance the Federal budget, and start getting this country out of debt. Mr. President, the balanced budget amendment is the first step on the long journey toward restoring fiscal sanity to Washington.

Mr. President, the statistics are clear: Our Nation currently faces a \$4½ trillion debt. That means every child born in America is immediately saddled with nearly \$20,000 in debt. And at the rate we are going, these numbers increase every year, taking with them the future of our children.

If America were a business, it would have been forced into bankruptcy years ago, with each Member of Congress liable for breach of duty. In previous centuries, there was a place for those who made a habit of spending more than they brought in: it was called debtor's prison. Today, it is called Congress.

Now, some in this body would argue that there is no need for a balanced

budget amendment to the Constitution. And they might have a case if we were talking about anyone else but Congress. After all, there are laws all over the books to prevent the accumulation of unmanageable debt.

But what happens when those who break the laws are those who make the laws? Simple. They ignore them.

Only the Constitution and the moral authority it represents will force Congress to do what it is supposed to do, what we were elected to do.

And only by passing a balanced budget amendment can we hope to show the American people that we will do our job and carry out the mandate they delivered last November.

Minnesotans have joined me in calling for a balanced budget amendment. It is not a new concept in our State. In fact, the first balanced budget amendment to the Constitution was sponsored in the 1930's by—not surprisingly—a Minnesotan, Congressman Harold Knutson. But like so many balanced budget amendments after it, it was left to die in committee.

Well today, more than 50 years later, we have the opportunity to complete Representative Knutson's work. And his idea that was good in the 1930's is still good today, and it ought to become part of the Constitution.

In following the balanced budget amendment, however, we must be careful that our efforts to balance the budget come through cuts in spending and not tax increases. Taxpayers did not cause the budget deficit, Congress did, and it would be unfair, unjust and unwise to cover up the irresponsible behavior of Congress by punishing taxpayers, through new taxes or higher taxes.

For that reason, I introduced my own version of the balanced budget amendment which requires that any legislation to increase taxes be approved by a three-fifths supermajority vote. It is based on the idea—unheard of in Washington—that it should be more difficult to tax away the people's hard-earned dollars than to spend them.

By requiring a supermajority vote, my legislation would protect taxpayers and put the burden on Congress to come up with the cuts.

While I prefer this version of the balanced budget amendment, I do not believe the perfect should be the enemy of the good. We can have a constitutional limitation on tax increases, and I plan to work with the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee to pass one.

But that can come at a later date. The House has scheduled a vote on such an amendment for April 15 of next year. I will urge the Senate to follow suit.

Believe me, we will pass a taxpayer protection clause to the Constitution. But let us pass the balanced budget amendment first.

And to those who might try to derail the balanced budget amendment, through killer amendments or parliamentary tactics, I ask you to think twice. I ask you to think about the impact that continued deficit spending will have on our economy, on the people's faith in their Government, and most importantly, on our children. Because it's their future we're mortgaging away with every new governmental program, with every additional dollar of debt we rack up.

When I decided to run for Congress, I did so because I was frustrated with the way our Government was being run.

Growing up on a dairy farm in Minnesota—where we did not have a lot of money, where we worked hard and cleaned our plates—taught me a lot of lessons about life. Most importantly, it taught me the fundamental principle that you should not spend what you do not have.

What kind of lessons are we teaching our children when Congress spends this country \$4½ trillion in debt and what will their future be like when they are forced to pay off our bills?

I do not want my kids or grandkids to grow up wondering why we left them holding the bag.

We have to do something now. And the balanced budget amendment is the first step.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to pass the balanced budget amendment without delay. Because every second we push this vote off is another dollar we take away from our kids. And our kids deserve better, our country deserves better.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate on both sides of the aisle support an increase in the minimum wage, and it is clear that the vast majority of the American people support an increase, too.

Last month, the Los Angeles Times conducted a poll of citizens across the country. As the results demonstrate, raising the minimum wage has extraordinarily high support across the entire spectrum of income groups, political party, and every other category, with the possible exception of the House Republican leadership.

Mr. President, I believe that the Los Angeles Times poll will be of interest to all of us in Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As you may know, the federal minimum wage is currently \$4.25 an hour. Do you favor increasing the minimum wage, or decreasing it, or keeping it the same? ("Eliminate" was a volunteered response)

THE LOS ANGELES TIMES POLL—NATIONAL SURVEY;
JANUARY 19–22, 1995

	In- crease	Keep the same	De- crease	Elimi- nate	Don't know
Total sample	72	24	1	1	2
Gender:					
Male	67	28	1	1	3
Female	76	21	1	—	2
Age:					
18–29 years old	76	19	1	—	4
30–44 years old	74	23	—	1	2
45–64 years old	69	27	1	1	2
65 year and older	69	28	1	1	1
Ethnicity/Race:					
White	67	29	1	1	2
Black	92	5	—	—	3
Income:					
Less than \$20,000	80	15	1	1	3
\$20,000–\$39,999	76	21	—	—	3
\$40,000–\$59,999	69	26	1	1	3
\$60,000 and more	60	38	—	1	1
Education:					
High school or less	79	18	1	—	2
Some college	67	28	1	1	3
College graduate	59	36	1	2	2
Religious background:					
Protestant	72	24	—	1	3
Catholic	72	26	1	—	1
Party affiliation:					
Democrat	85	13	—	—	2
Independent	67	28	2	1	2
Republican	62	35	1	1	1
Political ideology:					
Liberal	82	16	—	—	2
Moderate	77	21	—	—	2
Conservative	63	33	1	1	2
Voter registration:					
Registered to vote	69	27	1	1	2
Not registered to vote	80	16	1	—	3
92 Presidential vote:					
Clinton	79	18	—	—	3
Bush	57	39	—	2	2
Perot	64	32	2	—	2
Location of home:					
City	76	21	1	1	1
Suburb	67	29	—	1	3
Small town	72	24	1	—	3
Rural	72	25	—	1	2
National region:					
East	76	21	1	1	1
Midwest	67	28	1	1	3
South	74	21	—	1	4
West	71	27	1	—	1
Union membership:					
Union member	82	16	—	—	2
Nonunion member	69	26	1	1	3
Union household	80	17	—	—	1
Nonunion household	69	27	1	1	2
Gender and party affiliation:					
Democratic men	82	17	—	—	1
Independent men	60	35	2	1	2
Republican men	60	36	1	2	1
Democratic women	87	10	—	—	3
Independent women	75	21	2	—	2
Republican women	64	35	—	—	1
Gender and age:					
Men 18–44 years old	72	23	—	1	4
Men 45 years and older	61	35	1	2	1
Women 18–44 years old	77	20	1	—	2
Women 45 years and older	76	21	1	—	2
Party and ideology:					
Liberal Democrats	85	13	—	—	2
Other Democrats	84	13	—	—	3
Conservative Republicans	55	41	1	2	1
Other Republicans	73	26	—	—	1
Working people and gender:					
Working men	66	28	1	2	3
Nonworking men	71	27	1	—	1
Working women	77	22	—	—	1
Nonworking women	76	19	1	—	4
Class and gender:					
Male upper class	53	45	—	1	1
Female upper class	66	33	—	—	1
Male middle class	66	30	1	2	1
Female middle class	77	20	1	—	2
Male working class	72	21	—	1	6
Female working class	81	16	1	—	2
Gender and race:					
White male	63	32	1	2	2
White female	71	26	1	—	2

(—) Indicates less than .5 percent.

HOW THE POLL WAS CONDUCTED

The Times Poll interviewed 1,353 adults nationwide, by telephone, Jan. 19 through 22. Telephone numbers were chosen from a list of all exchanges in the nation. Random-digit dialing techniques were used so that listed and non-listed numbers could be contacted. Interviewing was conducted in English and Spanish. The sample was weighted slightly to conform with census figures for sex, race, age and education. The margin of sampling error for the total sample is plus or minus 3 percentage points. For certain other subgroups the error margin may be somewhat

higher. Poll results can also be affected by other factors such as question wording and the order in which questions are presented.

DR. DAVID ELTON TRUEBLOOD

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, this past Saturday, January 28, in Richmond, IN, 150 persons from around the world gathered at Earlham College's Stout Meetinghouse for a memorial service in honor of one of the 20th century America's most prominent religious leaders, Dr. David Elton Trueblood. Dr. Trueblood, professor-at-large emeritus at Earlham, died on December 20, 1994 at Lansdale, PA. He was 94 years of age.

Dr. Trueblood was no stranger to the Senate. He first served as the guest chaplain of the Senate in August 1972. I was pleased to serve as the cosponsor, along with his former Earlham student, our late colleague Senator John East of North Carolina, for Dr. Trueblood's second visit with us as guest chaplain on the National Day of Prayer, May 3, 1984. In addition, Mr. President, Dr. Trueblood was a close and valued personal friend of long standing to our colleague, Senator MARK HATFIELD. The two men first met at Stanford University in 1946, when Dr. Trueblood was serving as the chaplain of that great institution and Senator HATFIELD was a young graduate student there.

Although he was born on a small farm near Indianola, IA, in 1900, Elton Trueblood had deep Indiana roots. His Quaker ancestors left North Carolina, where they had settled in 1682, and moved to Washington County, IN, in 1815. The Truebloods were part of the great migration of antislavery Quakers from the slaveholding States of the South to the increasingly abolitionist States of the North in the decades before the Civil War.

By the time that Dr. Trueblood joined Earlham's faculty as professor of philosophy in 1946, he had already established a distinguished academic career and a growing national reputation as a religious writer and speaker. After graduating from Iowa's William Penn College, he had earned the graduate degree of bachelor of systematic theology from Harvard University in 1926. He was awarded his doctor of philosophy degree from the Johns Hopkins University in 1934.

It was during Dr. Trueblood's studies at Johns Hopkins University that his career in the academic and religious worlds began to intersect with the Nation's political life. While completing his doctorate at Johns Hopkins, Dr. Trueblood served as the clerk of the Baltimore yearly meeting of the Religious Society of Friends. Already in demand as a preacher, Dr. Trueblood was invited to deliver the sermon at a Quaker meeting in Washington, DC. In the congregation that day was the first Quaker to become President of the United States, Herbert Hoover. That first encounter led to a long friendship between the two men which culminated in Dr. Trueblood's delivery of the eulo-

gy at President Hoover's funeral some 35 years later.

After completing his doctoral studies at Johns Hopkins, Dr. Trueblood accepted teaching assignments at Guilford College, in North Carolina, and then at Haverford College, in Pennsylvania. After a temporary assignment as the acting chaplain of Harvard, Dr. Trueblood became the chaplain of Stanford University in 1936. He held a dual faculty appointment at Stanford as professor of philosophy.

The friendship between Herbert Hoover and Elton Trueblood blossomed when Dr. Trueblood arrived at the Stanford campus, to which President Hoover had moved after he left the White House in 1933. When President Hoover died in 1964, the Hoover family called Dr. Trueblood back from a round-the-world cruise to conduct the memorial services for the former President in West Branch, IA. After flying back to the United States from Saigon, Dr. Trueblood delivered a stirring eulogy to the 31st President before the 75,000 persons gathered for the funeral services on a hillside overlooking the Hoover Library.

When, in 1946, Dr. Trueblood received his offer to come to Earlham in Indiana, he faced a difficult decision. He enjoyed the prestige of a tenured full professorship at one of the Nation's leading universities. He was, as I noted, also Stanford's chaplain and the close friend and neighbor of former President Hoover. Yet Dr. Trueblood yearned for a smaller educational institution, for a return to his Quaker roots, and for greater freedom to pursue his writing and public speaking. And so, Mr. President, Dr. Trueblood accepted Earlham's offer, a decision about which he wrote in an article entitled "Why I Chose a Small College" for Reader's Digest.

After his arrival at Earlham in 1946, Dr. Trueblood's career as a religious writer and speaker earned him growing national following. Several years later, he was invited to speak in Washington, DC, before a church congregation that included President Dwight Eisenhower. President Eisenhower later invited Dr. Trueblood to the Oval Office at the White House. Ultimately, President Eisenhower asked Dr. Trueblood to join his administration as the Director of Religious Information for the U.S. Information Agency.

During the Eisenhower administration, Elton Trueblood developed a friendship with the young man who would be the second Quaker to become President of the United States. The young man was Vice President Richard Nixon. Dr. Trueblood and Vice President Nixon stayed in regular contact after Dr. Trueblood returned to Earlham and throughout Mr. Nixon's post-Vice-Presidential years in California and New York.

After Mr. Nixon took office as President in 1969, he honored Dr. Trueblood by inviting him to speak at the Sunday